

Remarks/Arguments

The Examiner has again cited US Patent 6,400,702 to Meier. The Applicants have rewritten Claim 1 as Claim 10, which more clearly recites the invention.

The wireless devices disclosed in Meier are wireless access points or wireless stations that are functionally of the same type as defined in the 802.11 standard. Nowhere does Meier show or suggest:

“a device comprising a wireless interface for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of a centralized wireless network, wherein said associations are as defined by the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards, and a link management module for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices connected to said at least one other network with said access point of said centralized wireless network, such that said devices connected to said at least one other network will appear as wireless stations to the access point”,

as specifically recited in Claim 10.

Nothing in Meier would suggest managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of a centralized wireless network; and nothing would suggest a link management module. In particular, the devices connected to the wired network do not appear as wireless stations to the access point of the OWL network.

Consequently Claim 10 is new and inventive in view of Meier. The Applicants submit that the cited patent to Meier does not show or suggest this structure, and therefore does not affect the patentability of the invention as defined by Claim 10.

The Examiner has applied US 5,570,366 to Baker et al to Claims 2-9. The Examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection.

Baker et al. discloses a device for connecting a centralized wireless network to at least one other network (the Access Point, e.g. column 1, lines 15-25). However, nowhere does Baker et al disclose the features of the device of claim 10. Nowhere does Baker et al show or suggest a device being a wireless station compliant to the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards. In Baker et al, the device that connects the centralized wireless network to another network is only the access point; it is not a wireless station. Baker discloses mobile terminals in a wireless network. It does not introduce any specific features in those terminals. In particular, Baker does not disclose a device having a wireless interface for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of said centralized wireless network. Baker et al does not disclose a mobile terminal device having a bridge module. Baker does not disclose a device comprising the link management module of Claim 10.

Even if the structures of Meier and Baker et al were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 10 would not be affected. Neither Meier nor Baker et al show or suggest:

“a device comprising a wireless interface for managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of a centralized wireless network, wherein said associations are as defined by the IEEE 802.11 or Hiperlan2 standards, and a link management module for managing associations of different MAC addresses corresponding to devices connected to said at least one other network with said access point of said centralized wireless network, such that said devices connected to said at least one other network will appear as wireless stations to the access point”,

as specifically recited in Claim 10. Neither suggests managing more than one MAC address for association with an access point of a centralized wireless network; and neither suggests a link management module. It is therefore clear that even if the structures of Meier and Baker et al were to be combined, the patentability of Claim 10 would not be affected.

Claims 2-9 are dependent from Claim 10 and add further advantageous features. The Applicants submit that these subclaims are patentable as their parent Claim 10.

The Applicants submit that this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Sebastien Perrot et al.

by: __/Daniel E. Sragow/_____
Daniel E. Sragow, Attorney
Reg. No. 22,856
Tel. No. (609) 734-6832

Thomson Licensing LLC
Patent Operations
2 Independence Way
Princeton, NJ 08543-5312

Date: ____24 June 2009_____